

GENERALIZED MOYAL STRUCTURES IN PHASE-SPACE, KINETIC EQUATIONS AND THEIR CLASSICAL LIMIT

I. GENERAL FORMALISM

CONSTANTINOS TZANAKIS

University of Crete, 74100 Rethymnon, Crete, Greece

ALKIS P. GRECOS*

Service de Physique Statistique et Plasmas

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Campus Plaine (CP 231)

1050 Bruxelles, Belgium

ABSTRACT Generalised Wigner and Weyl transformations of quantum operators are defined and their properties, as well as those of the algebraic structure induced on the phase-space are studied. Using such transformations, quantum linear evolution equations are given a phase-space representation. In particular this is done for the general kinetic equation of the Lindblad type. The resulting expressions are better suited for the passage to the classical limit and for a general comparison of classical and quantum systems. In this context a preliminary discussion of a number of problems of kinetic theory of open systems is given, whereas explicit applications are made in the next paper of the series.

* Association Euratom, Etat Belge.

1. INTRODUCTION

The formal similarity of the mathematical structures of classical and quantum mechanics is perhaps best revealed in the context of statistical mechanics and kinetic theory. This is due to the formal similarity of their corresponding starting points, the Liouville and von Neumann equations (Schrödinger representation) or their formal adjoints (Heisenberg representation) which can be put in the form:

$$\text{states } \rho: \quad \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -iL\rho \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\text{observables } A: \quad \frac{\partial A}{\partial t} = iLA \quad (1.1b)$$

$$L = \begin{cases} i\{H, \cdot\} & \text{classical} \\ \frac{1}{\hbar}[H, \cdot] & \text{quantum} \end{cases} \quad (1.2a)$$

$$(1.2b)$$

Here H is the system's Hamiltonian and $\{, \}, [,]$ are respectively, the Poisson bracket and operator commutator.

In very broad terms, a fundamental problem in kinetic theory concerns the systematic derivation from dynamics, i.e.-from (1.1), of evolution equations for the states or observables of the system and calculation of the corresponding expectation values, by making well-defined assumptions concerning the system and employing systematic approximation schemes to (1.1). Several such procedures exist, which at the level of the formalism, treat classical and quantum systems on an equal footing, most differences appearing at the level of applications to specific systems (e.g. [1] and to a lesser extent [2]). However, the relation between general results concerning classical and quantum systems is not always clear. This is due to the fact that

- (i) there is no unique way of defining the quantum operator corresponding to a classical phase-space function
- (ii) conversely, there is no unique way of mapping quantum operators to classical functions. Associated to this is the fact that there is a variety of ways to pass to the classical limit of quantum mechanical expressions.

The main reason for these difficulties is related to the fact that.

- (a) In (1.2), L is defined on totally different spaces
- (b) L in (1.2b), unlike L in (1.2a) is defined through an associative product. This is one of the reasons why quantum kinetic equations are sometimes more easily derived than the corresponding classical ones.

It is the purpose of the present series of papers to contribute to a unified approach for the deduction from dynamics (i.e. from (1.1)) of kinetic equations describing dissipative phenomena in classical and quantum systems, by using phase-space methods for both, so that the underlying space is the same. In this way, a clear

comparison of the differences between classical and quantum systems imposed by the noncommutative mathematical structure characterizing the latter, will be more easily made. In particular, a clear formulation of the passage to the classical limit of quantum mechanical kinetic equations will be a more tractable problem. Moreover, conditions under which this limit exists, or the reasons for which it may not exist, will be more easily formulated.

It is a well-known that phase-space methods in quantum theory originated through the pionnering work of Weyl and Wigner, who gave respectively possible solutions to the problems (i) and (ii) mentioned above, [3], [12]. Since the work of Moyal, [4], who showed the relation between the Weyl and Wigner transformations, many other possible transformations have been investigated, particularly in the context of quantum optics [5], [25]. However it seems that many researchers in this field adopted an attitude in which the following points dominate:

- to justify in one or another way the assertion that the Weyl transformation and its inverse (the Wigner transformation) is the *only* possibility for relating classical and quantum systems (see e.g. [6]).

- to develop quantum mechanics in phase-space *without* reference to the Hilbert state-space and some associated Banach algebra of linear operators. In this connection the Moyal formulation of quantum mechanics (QM) is used, which amounts to introducing the structure of a nonabelian algebra for classical phase-space functions [6], [7], [8].

However (a) the Wigner transformation presents severe problems if one wishes to retain a probabilistic interpretation of QM in phase-space (specifically, it does not conserve the positivity of the state).

(b) the Moyal formulation of QM is much more difficult to apply to specific problems. In fact simple systems studied in a most elegant way by conventional QM, turns out to require sophisticated mathematical methods in the Moyal formulation [7].

In our opinion a more "pragmatic" point of view is desirable: To accept that both conventional QM and its phase-space formulation have their merits, exploit their advantages as much as possible and use results known for classical systems to draw conclusions for quantum systems and vice versa. Adopting such a point of view in the present series of papers, we are intended to contribute to a phase-space formulation of quantum kinetic equations and study in this context some problems of kinetic theory which are described in the rest of this section.

After the introduction of the generalized Weyl and Wigner transformations in section 2, their properties are further explored in section 3 and the associated generalized Moyal algebras are studied. In section 4 the corresponding phase-space counterpart of quantum statistical evolution equations is given. Moreover we show that under quite general conditions, starting from (1.1), quantum kinetic theory of open systems in a projection operator language ([9], [28], [21]) can be developped in

phase-space right from the beginning, using the algebra structure induced on phase-space functions by generalized Wigner transformations. The converse problem is studied in section 5, in which we obtain the phase-space counterpart of a quantum kinetic equation of the Lindblad type, [24], which as it is well-known, is the most general equation conserving the probabilistic nature of the density matrix (the assumptions for its derivation need not be discussed here!).

In the second paper of this series (hereafter called paper II), we give specific applications of the general formalism to quantum harmonic oscillator models, generalizing other approaches based on particular choices of operator orderings, and compare them with the corresponding results for classical systems. Moreover we show that the classical limit of the corresponding kinetic equations is independent of the generalized Wigner transformation used, provided that the induced generalized Moyal bracket is a deformation of the Poisson bracket.

Finally in the third paper (hereafter called paper III) we will discuss certain problems of kinetic theory of open systems, a brief account of which is the following: Various approaches in kinetic theory of open systems start from dynamics and lead to kinetic equations of the Lindblad type for quantum systems ([22], [23], [28]) or its classical analogue ([9], [29]). A basic limitation of these approaches is that a certain Liouville operator⁽¹⁾ must have a discrete spectrum, an assumption particularly restrictive for classical systems⁽²⁾. There are two possibilities out of this fundamental difficulty

(i) since for quantum systems (at least for finite ones) the above restriction does not exist, we may consider the classical limit of the kinetic equation for the corresponding quantum system. In this respect a phase-space formulation of quantum kinetic theory is helpful.

(ii) To generalize the formalism relaxing this assumption. Such a formal generalization has been suggested for classical multiply periodic open systems (i.e. integrable in action-angle variables) in [11].

Unfortunately both possibilities face difficulties

For (i) : In *particular* examples the classical limit does not exist since the limiting equations contain divergent terms ([21] ch. 7). It is important to decide whether or not this is a general feature. Or, to put it differently, under what conditions the classical limit exists. In [11], section 4 it has been conjectured that divergencies appear because of the structure of (1.2a), particularly that L there is a differential (hence unbounded) operator. A unified phase-space formulation of kinetic theory, either classical or quantum is most suited for the examination of this problem (see also end of section 3 and footnote in section 4.1).

⁽¹⁾ For open systems it is the Liouville operator of the system when no interaction with its surroundings exists.

⁽²⁾ Other formalisms not exhibiting such a limitation lead to mathematically unacceptable or physically incorrect results ([9] § 5, [10], [30], §§ 1, 2, [31] §§ 1, 5).

For (ii): The formalism in [11] has not yet been made mathematically rigorous. An *independent* test of its validity is to obtain kinetic equations for the corresponding quantum system and compare them with those of the (generalized) classical formalism of [11]. Once again this presupposes that the (interesting per se) nontrivial old problem of finding the quantum analogues of the classical multiply periodic systems has been answered definitely (see e.g. [19], [20], [13]). Phase-space methods may be proved fruitful in this context. In fact, one can consider the more general problem of giving an explicit expression of the generalized Weyl or Wigner transforms of canonically or unitarily conjugate quantities respectively.

These and related questions will be examined in paper III in detail.

2. THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN CLASSICAL PHASE-SPACE FUNCTIONS AND QUANTUM MECHANICAL OPERATORS

In what follows we consider non-relativistic systems. Classical systems are assumed to be Hamiltonian and their phase-space Γ is parametrized by the canonical variables (q, p) . For the sake of simplicity the discussion refers to an one-dimensional configuration space, but all results are directly generalized in many dimensions. We use the following notation:

phase-space functions: $A = A(q, p)$

operators:

position $\hat{q}$

momentum $\hat{p}$

general $\hat{A}$

density matrix $\hat{\rho}$

Planck's constant $\mu = \frac{i\hbar}{2}$

matrix elements

$$\langle x | \hat{q} | x' \rangle = \delta(x - x')$$

$$\langle x | \hat{p} | x' \rangle = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \delta(x - x')$$

$$\langle x | \hat{A} | x' \rangle \equiv A(x, x')$$

$$\langle x | \hat{\rho} | x' \rangle \equiv \rho(x, x') \equiv \langle x, x' | \hat{\rho} \rangle$$

Fourier transforms:

$$\tilde{A}(\eta, \xi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dq dp e^{-i(\eta q + \xi p)} A(q, p)$$

$$A(q, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\eta d\xi e^{i(\eta q + \xi p)} \tilde{A}(\eta, \xi)$$

Often we write

$$z = (q, p), \quad \hat{z} = (\hat{q}, \hat{p}), \quad \sigma = (\eta, \xi)$$

Finally unless otherwise stated, we assume that $\hat{q}, \hat{p}$ have the whole real line in their spectrum⁽³⁾. The approach is formal but it will be seen that with no essential restrictions we may suppose that all functions are generalized functions in either the Schwarz space $\mathcal{D}'$ or the space of tempered distributions $\mathcal{I}'$ (see e.g. [26]).

2.1 THE WEYL AND WIGNER TRANSFORMATIONS:

For any $A(q, p)$ its Weyl transform is the operator

$$\Omega_w : A(q, p) \longrightarrow \Omega_w(A) \equiv \hat{A} \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\sigma \tilde{A}(\sigma) e^{i\sigma \hat{z}} \quad (2.1)$$

For any $\hat{A}$ its Wigner transform is the phase-space function

$$W : \hat{A} \longrightarrow W(\hat{A}) \equiv A(q, p) \equiv 2 \int dt e^{\frac{-pt}{\mu}} \langle q - t | \hat{A} | q + t \rangle \quad (2.2)$$

A direct calculation using the identities

$$e^{i(\eta\hat{q}+\xi\hat{p})} = e^{\frac{i\eta\hat{q}}{2}} e^{i\xi\hat{p}} e^{\frac{i\eta\hat{q}}{2}} = e^{\mu\eta\xi} e^{i\eta\hat{q}} e^{i\xi\hat{p}} \quad (2.3)$$

$$\langle x | e^{i(\eta\hat{q}+\xi\hat{p})} | x' \rangle = e^{i\eta(x-i\mu\xi)} \delta(x' - x + 2i\mu\xi) \quad (2.4)$$

shows that

$$W(\Omega_w(A)) = A, \quad \Omega_w(W(\hat{A})) = \hat{A}$$

so that

$$W = \Omega_w^{-1}$$

Eq.(2.1) is defined so that $q^n p^m$ corresponds to the Weyl-ordered operator

$$\Omega_w(q^n p^m) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \hat{q}^k \hat{p}^m \hat{q}^{n-k} \quad (2.5)$$

whereas (2.2) is defined so that for any $\hat{\rho}, \hat{A}$

$$Tr(\hat{\rho}\hat{A}) = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int \rho A dp dq \quad (2.6a)$$

⁽³⁾ It is possible to extend the formalism so that it includes the case when $\hat{p}$ has a point spectrum. This is important in kinetic theory where often one first considers confined systems and eventually pass to the thermodynamic limit of an infinite system having finite local properties. However we will not present the corresponding calculations here because the resulting expressions are more complicated since in the limits of all integrations the size of the system has to be taken into account.

$$\rho \equiv \Omega_w^{-1}(\hat{\rho}), \quad A \equiv \Omega_w^{-1}(\hat{A}) \quad (2.6b)$$

In fact $\frac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\rho$ is the Wigner function associated with the density matrix $\hat{\rho}$, hence quantum statistical expectations are obtained by classical-type phase-space averages. However there are other orderings, distinct from (2.5) and useful in applications, for which the inverse transformations satisfy (2.6). Before proceeding to their study we notice that if for any phase-space functions f, g we define the $*$ -operation

$$f * g = \Omega_w^{-1}(\Omega_w(f)\Omega_w(g)) \quad (2.7)$$

then $*$ endows phase-space functions equipped with the ordinary structure of a linear space $F(\Gamma)$, with the structure of a nonabelian, associative algebra. The commutator associated with the $*$ -product is defined by

$$\frac{1}{2\mu}[f, g]_M = \frac{1}{2\mu}(f * g - g * f) \quad (2.8)$$

and for $\mu \rightarrow 0$ it gives the Poisson bracket $\{f, g\}$. Eq.(2.8) defines the so-called Moyal product.

Remarks: Because of (2.6), the Wigner transformation allows for a phase-space formulation of quantum statistical mechanics. In fact, appart from (2.6), eq.(2.2) implies the following properties:

If $\Omega_w^{-1}(\hat{A}) \equiv A_w(q, p)$ then

- (i) $\hat{A} = \hat{A}^+ \Leftrightarrow A_w = A_w^*$
- (ii) $Tr \hat{A} = 1 \Leftrightarrow \int A_w dq dp = 2\pi\hbar$
- (iii) $\Omega_w^{-1}(\hat{q}^k) = q^k, \quad \Omega_w^{-1}(\hat{p}^k) = p^k$
- (iv) if $\hat{A} = \hat{\rho} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is a pure state then

$$\int \rho_w(q, p) dp = 2\pi\hbar |\psi(q)|^2$$

$$\int \rho_w(q, p) dq = 2\pi |\tilde{\psi}(\frac{p}{\hbar})|^2$$

Here z^* is the complex conjugate of z . These properties will be considered in section 3 in a more general context. We only notice that (2.6) together with (i), (ii) above, would imply that the probabilistic interpretation of a density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ is retained in a phase-space formulation, provided that $\rho_w \geq 0$ whenever $\hat{\rho} \geq 0$. However it is well-known that this is not true (see e.g. [2b] p.99, [4] p.116 and corrolary to proposition 3.4 below).

2.2 GENERALIZED WEYL AND WIGNER TRANSFORMATIONS AND THE ASSOCIATED MOYAL STRUCTURE

A substantial and natural generalization of (2.1), which includes many useful orderings of operators distinct from (2.5) are given by ([14]) ⁽⁴⁾

$$\Omega : A(q, p) \rightarrow \Omega(A) \equiv \hat{A} \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\sigma \Omega(\sigma) \tilde{A}(\sigma) e^{i\sigma \hat{z}} \quad (2.9)$$

For the weighting function Ω we assume that it is an entire complex analytic function, with no zeros ([5a] p. 2166). The reason for this will become evident below. If $A(q, p) = q^n p^m$ then (2.9) gives an ordering different from (2.5). If

$$\omega(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\sigma e^{i\sigma z} \frac{1}{\Omega(\sigma)} \quad (2.10)$$

then the inverse Ω -transformation exists and is given by

$$\Omega^{-1} : \hat{A} \rightarrow A(q, p) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int dq' dp' dt \omega(q - q', p - p') e^{-\frac{p't}{\mu}} \langle q' - t | \hat{A} | q' + t \rangle \quad (2.11)$$

The proof is straightforward, using (2.9), (2.10) and (2.3), (2.4). By (2.2) we see that

$$\Omega^{-1}(\hat{A}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dq' dp' \omega(q - q', p - p') A_w(q', p') = \frac{1}{2\pi} \omega \odot A_w \quad (2.11')$$

where by $\odot$ we denote the convolution of two functions.

Consequently $\widetilde{f \odot g} = (2\pi \widetilde{fg})$, hence

$$\Omega^{-1}(\hat{A}) \equiv A(q, p) \Rightarrow \tilde{A}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\Omega(\sigma)} \tilde{A}_w(\sigma) \quad (2.12)$$

and by (2.2)

$$\tilde{A}_w(\eta, \xi) = -2i\mu \int dq e^{-i\eta q} \langle q + i\mu\xi | \hat{A} | q - i\mu\xi \rangle \quad (2.2')$$

⁽⁴⁾ It can be shown that any linear transformation of quantum operators to phase-space functions which is phase-space translation invariant is of the form (2.11'). The calculations however will not be reproduced here. Compare with [6b] in which Galilei invariance, conservation of hermiticity and normalization of operators ensures that (2.11') reduces to the Wigner transformation.

from (2.12) or directly from (2.11'), (2.10) we obtain that

$$\Omega^{-1}(\hat{A}) = \frac{-i\mu}{\pi} \int dq' d\eta d\xi \frac{e^{i[\eta(q-q')+\xi p]}}{\Omega(\eta, \xi)} < q' + i\mu\xi \mid \hat{A} \mid q' - i\mu\xi > \quad (2.11'')$$

Finally, in analogy with (2.7) we endow $F(\Gamma)$ with the structure of a nonabelian associative algebra, and consequently with a Lie algebra structure, by defining for $f, g \in F(\Gamma)$

$$f *_{\Omega} g = \Omega^{-1}(\Omega(f)\Omega(g)) \quad (2.13a)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\mu}[f, g] = \frac{1}{2\mu}(f *_{\Omega} g - g *_{\Omega} f) \quad (2.13b)$$

Hereafter the Lie product in (2.13b) will be called the generalized Moyal product and (2.9), (2.11) a generalized Weyl and Wigner transformation respectively.

Remark: We use the same symbol for the generalized Weyl transformation Ω and for its kernel in (2.9). However since the argument of the latter is always $\sigma = (\eta, \xi)$ etc, there is no confusion.

3. THE $*_{\Omega}$ - ALGEBRAS AND THEIR PROPERTIES

3.1 In this section we will investigate the properties of (2.13). We first give an explicit expression of (2.13). By (2.9) we have

$$\Omega(f)\Omega(g) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') \Omega(\sigma) \Omega(\sigma') e^{(i\sigma\hat{z})} e^{(i\sigma'\hat{z})}$$

Using (2.3) we find that

$$e^{i\sigma\hat{z}} e^{i\sigma'\hat{z}} = e^{i\hbar\xi\eta'} e^{i\hbar\frac{\xi\eta+\xi'\eta'}{2}} e^{i\hat{q}(\eta+\eta')} e^{i\hat{p}(\xi+\xi')}$$

$$e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')\hat{z}} = e^{i\hbar\frac{\xi\eta+\xi\eta'+\xi'\eta+\xi'\eta'}{2}} e^{i\hat{q}(\eta+\eta')} e^{i\hat{p}(\xi+\xi')}$$

hence

$$e^{i\sigma\hat{z}} e^{i\sigma'\hat{z}} = e^{\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma)} e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')\hat{z}} \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\sigma' \wedge \sigma = (\eta', \xi') \wedge (\eta, \xi) = \eta'\xi - \eta\xi'$$

is the exterior product of σ' and σ . Substituting (3.1) in the expression for $\Omega(f)\Omega(g)$ and using (2.13) we get

$$(f *_{\Omega} g)(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') \Omega(\sigma) \Omega(\sigma') e^{\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma)} \Omega^{-1}(e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')\hat{z}})$$

But by (2.9) it is easily seen that

$$\Omega(e^{i\sigma z}) = e^{i\sigma \hat{z}} \Omega(\sigma) \quad (3.2)$$

hence

$$(f *_{\Omega} g)(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') \frac{\Omega(\sigma) \Omega(\sigma')}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma')} e^{\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma)} e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')z} \quad (3.3)$$

Another form of (3.3) can be found as follows: We define the commuting pairs of operators

$$\hat{q} = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial q}, \quad \hat{p} = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial p}, \quad \hat{q}' = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial q'}, \quad \hat{p}' = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial p'}$$

having respectively eigenvalues η, ξ, η', ξ' and eigenprojections $F_{\eta}, F_{\xi}, F_{\eta'}, F_{\xi'}$, where

$$\langle q, p | F_{\eta} | \tilde{q}, \tilde{p} \rangle = \frac{e^{i\eta(q-\tilde{q})}}{2\pi} \delta(p - \tilde{p})$$

$$\langle q, p | F_{\xi} | \tilde{q}, \tilde{p} \rangle = \frac{e^{i\xi(p-\tilde{p})}}{2\pi} \delta(q - \tilde{q})$$

and similarly for $F_{\eta'}, F_{\xi'}$. Then we readily find that for any functions f, g .

$$\frac{e^{i\sigma z}}{(2\pi)^2} \tilde{f}(\sigma) = (F_{\eta} F_{\xi} f)(z) \quad \frac{e^{i\sigma' z}}{(2\pi)^2} \tilde{g}(\sigma') = (F_{\eta'} F_{\xi'} f)(z)$$

Therefore (3.3) can be rewritten as (c.f. [5a] p. 2190, eq(3.3))

$$f *_{\Omega} g(z) = (2\pi)^2 \Omega(\hat{z}) \Omega(\hat{z}') \Omega^{-1}(\hat{z} + \hat{z}') e^{\mu(\hat{z}' \wedge \hat{z})} f(z) g(z')|_{z=z'} \quad (3.3')$$

Eq. (3.3) readily implies that

$$(\widetilde{f *_{\Omega} g})(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\Omega(\sigma)} \int d\sigma' e^{\mu(\sigma \wedge \sigma')} \Omega(\sigma') \Omega(\sigma - \sigma') \tilde{f}(\sigma') \tilde{g}(\sigma - \sigma') \quad (3.4)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\mu} [f, g](z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' \frac{\Omega(\sigma) \Omega(\sigma')}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma')} \frac{\sinh \mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma)}{\mu} \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')z} \quad (3.5)$$

On the other hand, if we define the mapping

$$f \rightarrow Uf : \quad Uf(z) = \int d\sigma \Omega(\sigma) \tilde{f}(\sigma) e^{i\sigma z} \quad (3.6)$$

then we can easily show that

$$U(f *_\Omega g) = Uf * Ug \quad (3.7)$$

thus proving

Proposition 3.1: The $*$ and $*_\Omega$ products define isomorphic algebras on $F(\Gamma)$ ⁽⁵⁾.

Proof: Evidently (3.6) is linear and its inverse is

$$f \rightarrow U^{-1}f : \quad U^{-1}f(z) = \int d\sigma \frac{1}{\Omega(\sigma)} \tilde{f}(\sigma) e^{i\sigma z}$$

Moreover $\widetilde{Uf}(\sigma) = \tilde{f}(\sigma)\Omega(\sigma)$, so that by (3.4) we have

$$[U(f *_\Omega g)]^\sim(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\sigma' e^{\mu(\sigma \wedge \sigma')} \Omega(\sigma') \Omega(\sigma - \sigma') \tilde{f}(\sigma') \tilde{g}(\sigma - \sigma')$$

where $[U(f *_\Omega g)]^\sim(\sigma)$ is the Fourier transform of $U(f *_\Omega g)$. On the other hand by (3.4) with $\Omega = 1$ we get the same expression for $(Uf * Ug)^\sim(\sigma)$ Q.E.D.

Eqs (2.8), (3.7) imply that

$$\frac{1}{2\mu} [f, g] = U^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2\mu} [Uf, Ug]_M \right) \quad (3.8)$$

Moreover from (3.5) with $\Omega = 1$ it is straightforward to show that

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\mu} [f, g]_M = \{f, g\} \quad (3.9)$$

In general $\Omega(\sigma)$, hence U , depends on μ . Let us then assume that $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \Omega(\sigma) \equiv \Omega_0(\sigma)$ exists and is continuous and denote by U_0 the corresponding transformation in (3.6). Then (3.8) implies

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\mu} [f, g] = U_0^{-1} \{U_0 f, U_0 g\} \quad (3.8')$$

⁽⁵⁾ This is a special case of a more general result: If in (3.3) the kernel $\frac{\Omega(\sigma)\Omega(\sigma')}{\Omega(\sigma+\sigma')} e^{\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma)}$ is replaced by $B(\sigma, \sigma')$ and we require this operation to be associative, then (3.3) is the only possibility. This is closely related to the uniqueness of the Moyal-algebra considered in [18]. These results will be presented elsewhere.

If, in analogy with (3.9), we require that the l.h.s. of (3.8') is $\{f, g\}$ then U_0 must be an automorphism of the Poisson Lie algebra, i.e.

$$U_0(\{f, g\}) = \{U_0 f, U_0 g\} \quad (3.10)$$

By (3.6) the r.h.s. of (3.10) is easily seen to be

$$\{U_0 f, U_0 g\}(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma) \Omega_0(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') \Omega_0(\sigma') e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')z} (\sigma \wedge \sigma')$$

whereas

$$\widetilde{\{f, g\}}(\tau) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int dz' e^{-iz'\tau} \int d\sigma d\sigma' e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')z} \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') (\sigma \wedge \sigma')$$

so that we finally get from (3.6)

$$U_0\{f, g\}(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')z} \Omega_0(\sigma + \sigma') \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') (\sigma \wedge \sigma')$$

Therefore (3.10) is equivalent to

$$\Omega_0(\sigma + \sigma') = \Omega_0(\sigma) \Omega_0(\sigma') \Leftrightarrow \Omega_0(\sigma) = c e^{k\sigma}$$

$c, k \equiv (k_1, k_2)$ being constants. If we further assume that $\Omega_0(q) = \hat{q}, \Omega_0(p) = \hat{p}$ then $\Omega_0(\sigma) = 1$. Thus we have proved

Proposition 3.2: If (i) $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\mu} [f, g] = \{f, g\}$

(ii) $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \Omega(\sigma) = \Omega_0(\sigma)$ is continuous and $(q, p) \rightarrow (\hat{q}, \hat{p})$ via Ω_0 then $\Omega_0(\sigma) = 1$. If in addition Ω is μ -independent then the only $*_{\Omega}$ -product, the associated Lie bracket of which tends to the Poisson bracket as $\mu \rightarrow 0$ is the Moyal product.

3.2: As already stated in section 2, the main motivation for introducing the Wigner transform is eq(2.6). Here we generalize this equation for the $*_{\Omega}$ -product:

Proposition 3.3: For any $f, g \in F(\Gamma)$

$$Tr(\Omega(f)\Omega(g)) = \frac{\Omega(0)}{2\pi\hbar} \int f *_{\Omega} g \, dz \quad (3.11)$$

Proof : By (2.9) we have

$$Tr(\Omega(f)\Omega(g)) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') \Omega(\sigma) \Omega(\sigma') Tr(e^{\sigma \hat{z}} e^{\sigma' \hat{z}})$$

From (3.1), (2.4) we have

$$Tr(e^{\sigma\hat{z}}e^{\sigma'\hat{z}}) = e^{\mu(\sigma'\wedge\sigma)}Tr(e^{i(\sigma+\sigma')\hat{z}}) = e^{\mu(\sigma'\wedge\sigma)}\frac{2\pi}{\hbar}\delta(\sigma+\sigma')$$

hence

$$Tr(\Omega(f)\Omega(g)) = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int d\sigma \tilde{f}(\sigma)\tilde{g}(-\sigma)\Omega(\sigma)\Omega(-\sigma) \quad (3.12)$$

On the other hand (3.3) implies

$$\int f *_\Omega g \, dz = \int d\sigma \tilde{f}(\sigma)\tilde{g}(-\sigma)\frac{\Omega(\sigma)\Omega(-\sigma)}{\Omega(0)} \quad (3.13)$$

and consequently (3.11) follows Q.E.D.

Remarks: (i) Eq (3.11) immediately implies that

$$Tr(\Omega(f)) = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int f \, dz$$

$$(ii) \int f *_\Omega g \, dz = \int g *_\Omega f \, dz$$

Corrolary: A neccesary and sufficient condition for

$$Tr(\Omega(f)\Omega(g)) = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int f g \, dz \quad (3.14)$$

is

$$\Omega(\sigma)\Omega(-\sigma) = \Omega(0) \quad (3.15)$$

Proof: Since $\int f g \, dz = \int \tilde{f}(\sigma)\tilde{g}(-\sigma)d\sigma$, (3.15) follows from (3.12)-(3.14) Q.E.D. Further properties of the $*_\Omega$ -structures are contained in the following

Proposition 3.4: (a) for any $f \in F(\Gamma)$, the requirement that f is real if and only if $\Omega(f)$ is hermitian, is equivalent to

$$\Omega(\sigma) = \Omega^*(-\sigma) \quad (3.16)$$

In that case

$$(f *_\Omega g)^* = g^* *_\Omega f^* \quad (3.16')$$

(b) The conditions

$$\Omega(0, \xi) = \Omega(\eta, 0) = 1 \quad \forall \eta, \xi \in \mathcal{R} \quad (3.17)$$

are equivalent to either of the following

$$- \Omega(f(q)) = f(\hat{q}), \quad \Omega(g(p)) = g(\hat{p}) \quad \forall f, g \in F(\Gamma) \quad (3.18)$$

- If $\hat{\rho} = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ is a pure state then

$$\int \Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) dp = -4i\mu\pi |\Psi(q)|^2 \quad (3.19a)$$

$$\int \Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) dq = 2\pi |\tilde{\Psi}(\frac{p}{-2i\mu})|^2 \quad (3.19b)$$

Proof: Eq (3.16) follows from $\tilde{A}^*(\sigma) = (\tilde{A}(-\sigma))^*$, whereas (3.18) is an immediate consequence of (2.9). For the proof of (3.19) we proceed as follows:

From (2.11'') we readily get

$$\Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) = -\frac{i\mu}{\pi} \int dq' d\eta d\xi \frac{e^{i[\eta(q-q')+\xi p]}}{\Omega(\eta, \xi)} \Psi(q' + i\mu\xi) \Psi^*(q' - i\mu\xi) \quad (3.20)$$

hence

$$\int \Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) dp = -2i\mu \int dq' d\eta \frac{e^{i\eta(q-q')}}{\Omega(\eta, 0)} |\Psi(q')|^2$$

hence $\Omega(\eta, 0) = 1$ is equivalent to (3.19a). Eq (3.20) implies

$$\int \Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) dq = -2i\mu \int dq' d\xi \frac{e^{i\xi p}}{\Omega(0, \xi)} \Psi(q' + i\mu\xi) \Psi^*(q - i\mu\xi)$$

But since $\Psi(q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int dk e^{ikq} \tilde{\Psi}(k)$ substitution gives after some reductions, that

$$\int \Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) dq = -4i\mu\pi \int dk d\xi \frac{e^{i\xi(p+2i\mu k)}}{\Omega(0, \xi)} |\tilde{\Psi}(k)|^2$$

hence $\Omega(0, \xi) = 1$ is equivalent to (3.19b) Q.E.D.

Remark: For any operator $\hat{\rho}$, (3.17) is equivalent to

$$\int \Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) dp = -4i\mu\pi \langle q | \hat{\rho} | q \rangle \quad (3.19'a)$$

$$\int \Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) dq = 2\pi < \frac{p}{-2i\mu} | \hat{\rho} | \frac{p}{-2i\mu} > \quad (3.19'b)$$

where the r.h.s. in (3.19'b) is in momentum representation.

Corrolary: Conservation of hermiticity and (3.14) implies that the generalized Wigner transform *does not conserve* the positivity of the density matrix.

Proof: In the present notation and for any two phase-space functions we have by (2.12)

$$\begin{aligned} \int dz A^*(z) B(z) = \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int (\tilde{A}(\sigma))^* \tilde{B}(\sigma) d\sigma = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\sigma \frac{1}{\Omega^*(\sigma) \Omega(\sigma)} (\tilde{A}_w(\sigma))^* \tilde{B}_w(\sigma) \end{aligned}$$

If A, B correspond to pure states, i.e.

$$\Omega(A) = | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi |, \quad \Omega(B) = | \Phi \rangle \langle \Phi |$$

then by (2.11') an elementary calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int dz A^*(z) B(z) = \\ \frac{\hbar^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\eta d\xi dy dx \frac{e^{i\eta(y-x)} e^{-i\hbar\xi\eta}}{\Omega(\eta, \xi) \Omega^*(\eta, \xi)} (\Phi(x) \Psi^*(x)) (\Phi(y) \Psi^*(y))^* \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by (3.14), (3.16) we get

$$\int dz A(z) B(z) = \frac{\hbar}{(2\pi)^2 \Omega(0)} | \langle \Phi | \Psi \rangle |^2$$

since (3.16) implies that A, B are real. Therefore for a given Ψ , we can always choose a Φ orthogonal to it, and consequently either A or B become negative somewhere, since we assume that Φ, Ψ are not identically zero Q.E.D.

3.3: Irrespective of any considerations concerning the correspondence between classical and quantum systems, there is a very simple way to define a structure of a nonabelian algebra on $F(\Gamma)$. The motivation comes from considerations concerning the relation between stochastic mechanics (specifically the Itô calculus) and noncommutative geometry [15], [30]: We shall show below that this structure is induced on $F(\Gamma)$ by a particular Ω -transformation. We define a $*_{\lambda}$ -product as follows:

$$q *_{\lambda} p = qp + (\lambda + \nu) \quad (3.21a)$$

$$p *_{\lambda} q = qp + (\lambda - \nu) \quad \lambda, \nu \in \mathcal{C} \quad (3.21b)$$

and we require:

(a) $*_{\lambda}$ is associative and distributive with respect to vector-space addition in $F(\Gamma)$.

(b) For any $f(q), g(q), h(p), \sigma(p)$ we have

$$f(q) *_{\lambda} (g(q)h(p)) = (f(q) *_{\lambda} h(p))g(q) \quad (3.22a)$$

$$\sigma(p) *_{\lambda} (g(q)h(p)) = (\sigma(p) *_{\lambda} g(q))h(p) \quad (3.22b)$$

and the same relations hold for multiplication by f, σ from the right. Then it can be shown that for C^{∞} -functions f, g ([15]):

$$(f *_{\lambda} g)(q, p) = e^{[\lambda(\frac{\partial}{\partial q} \frac{\partial}{\partial p'} + \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \frac{\partial}{\partial q'}) + \nu(\frac{\partial}{\partial q} \frac{\partial}{\partial p'} - \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \frac{\partial}{\partial q'})]} f(z)g(z')|_{z=z'} \quad (3.23)$$

or in the notation of (3.3')

$$(f *_{\lambda} g) = e^{[-\lambda(\hat{q}\hat{p}' + \hat{q}'\hat{p}) + \nu(\hat{q}'\hat{p} - \hat{q}\hat{p}')] } f(z)g(z')|_{z=z'}$$

Comparison with (3.3') shows that the $*_{\lambda}$ -product is induced by a generalized Wigner transformation, provided that $\nu = \mu$, $\Omega(\eta, \xi) = e^{\lambda\xi\eta}$. Conversely we will now show.

Proposition 3.5: A necessary and sufficient condition for a $*_{\Omega}$ -product to satisfy (3.22) and $\Omega : (q, p) \rightarrow (\hat{q}, \hat{p})$, is that $\Omega(\eta, \xi) = e^{\lambda\eta\xi}$

Proof: For any $f(q), g(q), h(p)$ we have

$$\tilde{f}(\eta, \xi) = \sqrt{2\pi} \tilde{f}(\eta) \delta(\xi)$$

$$\widetilde{gh}(\eta, \xi) = \tilde{g}(\eta) \tilde{h}(\xi)$$

$$\tilde{h}(\eta, \xi) = \sqrt{2\pi} \tilde{h}(\xi) \delta(\eta)$$

hence by (3.3)

$$(f *_{\Omega} gh)(q, p) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{(\frac{3}{2})}} \int d\eta d\xi \tilde{f}(\eta) \tilde{h}(\xi) e^{-\mu\eta\xi} e^{i[q\eta + \xi p]} \Omega(\eta, 0) \int d\eta' e^{i\eta'q} \frac{\Omega(\eta', \xi)}{\Omega(\eta + \eta', \xi)} \tilde{g}(\eta')$$

On the other hand

$$(f *_{\Omega} h)(q, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\eta d\xi' \tilde{f}(\eta) \tilde{h}(\xi') e^{-\mu\eta\xi'} \frac{\Omega(\eta, 0)\Omega(0, \xi')}{\Omega(\eta, \xi')} e^{i(q\eta + \xi'p)}$$

so that

$$(g(f *_{\Omega} h))(q, p) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{(\frac{3}{2})}} \int d\eta d\xi \tilde{f}(\eta) \tilde{h}(\xi) e^{-\mu\eta\xi} e^{i[q\eta + \xi p]} \Omega(\eta, 0) \int d\eta' e^{i\eta' q} \frac{\Omega(0, \xi)}{\Omega(\eta, \xi)} \tilde{g}(\eta')$$

Therefore, comparison shows that for (3.22a) to hold it is necessary and sufficient that

$$\Omega(\eta', \xi) \Omega(\eta, \xi) = \Omega(0, \xi) \Omega(\eta + \eta', \xi)$$

Logarithmic differentiation shows that the solution is

$$\Omega(\eta, \xi) = \Omega(0, \xi) e^{\lambda(\xi)\eta}$$

In exactly the same way we find that (3.22b) is equivalent to

$$\Omega(0, \xi') \Omega(\eta, \xi) = \Omega(\eta, 0) \Omega(\eta, \xi + \xi')$$

so that

$$\Omega(0, \xi') \Omega(0, \xi) e^{[\lambda(\xi) + \lambda(\xi')]\eta} = \Omega(0, 0) \Omega(0, \xi + \xi') e^{[\lambda(\xi + \xi') + \lambda(0)]\eta}$$

For $\eta = 0$ and by logarithmic differentiation we once again show that

$$\Omega(0, \xi) = \Omega(0, 0) e^{a\xi}$$

hence $\lambda(\xi) + \lambda(\xi') = \lambda(\xi + \xi') + \lambda(0)$, from which we obtain $\lambda(\xi) = \lambda\xi + b$. Therefore

$$\Omega(\eta, \xi) = \Omega(0, 0) e^{\lambda\eta\xi} e^{a\xi + b\eta}$$

Requiring that $\Omega(q) = \hat{q}$, $\Omega(p) = \hat{p}$ implies $\Omega(0, 0) = 1$, $a = b = 0$ Q.E.D.

The dependence of $*_{\lambda}$ on the two parameters λ, μ gives the opportunity to consider in more detail the problems mentioned at the end of section 1: Since in the classical limit, the von-Neumann operator often has a continuous spectrum (e.g. think of a free particle in a box and that $\frac{1}{\hbar}[\hat{p}^2, \cdot] \rightarrow p \frac{\partial}{\partial q}$ as $\hbar \rightarrow 0^+$), it is important to be able to keep control of the discreteness of the spectrum, depending e.g. on λ , and quantum corrections, depending on μ . In this way divergencies appearing in the derivation of classical kinetic equations from dynamics discussed in section 1 can be better understood. This will be discussed in paper III (c.f. footnote in section 4, end of section 4 and [11] section 4). Here we only notice that for $\mu = 0$, $*_{\lambda}$ is a commutative product, different from the ordinary one. Moreover, for the sake of completeness we remark that from (3.4), (3.3) we can show that if Ω_{λ} is the transformation corresponding to $\Omega(\eta, \xi) = e^{\lambda\eta\xi}$, then

$$\Omega_{\lambda}(q^n p^m) = \sum_{l=0}^m (-i\lambda)^l \binom{m}{l} \binom{n}{l} l! \Omega_w(q^{n-l} p^{m-l})$$

where Ω_w is the Weyl transformation, eq.(2.5) (c.f. eq (4.4) in [15a]). Moreover

$$(f *_{\lambda} g)(q, p) = \frac{4}{\pi^2} e^{2i\theta} \int dy dy' d\rho d\rho' \{ f(q + y + y', p - 2ia(\rho - \rho')) g(q + y - y', p - 2ia(\rho + \rho')) e^{2i[(y\rho + y'\rho')(1 + e^{2i\theta}) + (y'\rho + y\rho')(1 - e^{2i\theta})]} \}$$

where

$$a = \lambda + \mu, \quad \theta = \arctan(-i \frac{\mu}{\lambda})$$

For $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$, $|a| = \frac{\hbar}{2}$ we get eq.(3.23) of [6a] for the $*$ -product eq.(2.7).

4. QUANTUM EVOLUTION EQUATIONS IN PHASE-SPACE REPRESENTATION

4.1: As already stated in section 1, one of the basic motivations for introducing the Wigner transform is the search for a phase-space formulation of quantum statistical mechanics. Here we explicit such a possibility.

Suppose that the quantum statistical state $\hat{\rho}$ satisfies the *linear* evolution equation

$$i \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = \hat{\Phi} \hat{\rho} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\hat{\Phi}$ is a superoperator acting on the state space of the quantum system. In position representation (4.1) becomes (cf. the notation at the beginning of section 2)

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \langle x, y | \hat{\rho} \rangle = \int dx' dy' \langle x, y | \hat{\Phi} | x', y' \rangle \langle x', y' | \hat{\rho} \rangle \tag{4.1'}$$

Putting $\Omega^{-1}(\hat{\rho}) \equiv \rho(q, p)$ we try to rewrite (4.1') in the equivalent form

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho(q, p) = \int dq' dp' \langle q, p | \Phi | q', p' \rangle \rho(q', p') \tag{4.2}$$

and express the generator in phase-space Φ , in terms of $\hat{\Phi}$ and Ω . Putting $x = q' - t$, $y = q' + t$ in (4.1') and using (2.11) we readily find

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho(q, p) =$$

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int dq' dp' dt dx' dy' \omega(q - q', p - p') e^{\frac{-p't}{\mu}} < q' - t, q' + t | \hat{\Phi} | x', y' > < x', y' | \hat{\rho} >$$

Making the substitutions $x' = q'' - s$, $y' = q'' + s$, using (2.4) in (2.9) to express $< x | \hat{\rho} | y >$ in terms of ρ and substituting above we finally get

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho(q, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int dq' dp' dt dq'' ds d\eta d\xi \omega(q - q', p - p') e^{\frac{-p't}{\mu}}$$

$$< q' - t, q' + t | \hat{\Phi} | q'' - s, q'' + s > \tilde{\rho}(\eta, \xi) \Omega(\eta, \xi) e^{i\eta q''} \delta(s - \frac{\hbar\xi}{2})$$

Writing $\delta(s - \frac{\hbar\xi}{2}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dp'' e^{ip''(\frac{\hbar\xi}{2} - s)}$, changing from p'' to $\frac{\hbar p''}{2}$ and using (2.12), (2.10), we find

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho(q, p) = \frac{1}{\pi^2 \hbar} \int dq' dq'' dp' dp'' d\tilde{q} d\tilde{p} ds dt e^{-\frac{p't}{\mu}} \omega(q - q', p - p')$$

$$< q' - t, q' + t | \hat{\Phi} | q'' - s, q'' + s > \omega(q'' - \tilde{q}, p'' - \tilde{p}) e^{\frac{sp''}{\mu}} \rho(\tilde{q}, \tilde{p}) \quad (4.3)$$

Comparison with (4.2) gives the desired expression for Φ :

$$< q, p | \Phi | q', p' > = \frac{1}{\pi^2 \hbar} \int d\tilde{q} d\tilde{p} d\tilde{q}' d\tilde{p}' ds dt e^{-\frac{\tilde{p}t}{\mu}}$$

$$\omega(q - \tilde{q}, p - \tilde{p}) < \tilde{q} - t, \tilde{q} + t | \hat{\Phi} | \tilde{q}' - s, \tilde{q}' + s > \omega(\tilde{q}' - q', \tilde{p}' - p') e^{\frac{s\tilde{p}'}{\mu}} \quad (4.4)$$

This expression is completely general for any *linear* $\hat{\Phi}$, hence more difficult to apply to specific examples. We may notice however that in actual applications, $\hat{\Phi}$ is usually constructed by using only the algebra structure of quantum operators or operations that can be considered as limiting cases of algebraic operations (e.g. integration of an operator depending on some parameter, with respect to this parameter). Then it is clear that since Ω^{-1} is an algebra homomorphism (c.f.(2.13)) and if $\hat{\Phi} = F(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \dots)$ then from (4.1) we obtain that

$$i \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \Phi f \equiv (\Omega^{-1}(\hat{\Phi})) f \quad (4.4'a)$$

$$\Omega^{-1}(\hat{\Phi}) \equiv F(\Omega^{-1}(\hat{A}), \Omega^{-1}(\hat{B}), \dots) \quad (4.4'b)$$

Here F is expressed as a function of its arguments, by using the $*_{\Omega}$ -product. Notice also that by (3.11), (4.4'), expectation values evolve according to

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int (A *_{\Omega} \rho) dz = \int A *_{\Omega} (\Phi \rho) dz \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover, (4.4') shows that at least formally $\Phi, \hat{\Phi}$ have the same spectrum and their eigenprojections are Ω -transforms of each other. In this way not only the classical limit of a quantum kinetic equation can be studied but also the spectral representation of its limit, if it exists, can be obtained. This approach can be used in two different ways:

(i) Either we start from dynamics, (1.1), obtain a quantum kinetic equation (4.1) by some systematic procedure and then take its Ω -transform to get its phase-space representation

or (ii) (1.1) is *directly* Ω -transformed and by the *same* procedure we obtain a quantum kinetic equation in phase-space.

Clearly the two ways must be compatible, or schematically the following diagram must be commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = -i\hat{L}\hat{\rho} & \longrightarrow & \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = -i\hat{\Phi}\hat{\rho} \\
\Omega^{-1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \Omega^{-1} \\
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -iL^{\Omega}\rho & \longrightarrow & \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -i\Phi\rho
\end{array}$$

where $L^{\Omega} = \Omega^{-1}(\hat{L}) = [\Omega^{-1}(\hat{H}), \cdot]$ (c.f.(2.13)).

By the *first* method, which is easier to apply, a quantum kinetic formalism in phase-space can be compared with a corresponding one for classical systems and be taken as a starting point for taking the classical limit of quantum kinetic equations. This is considered in the next section and paper II. Below we will apply the *second* method in the context of the general formalism for open systems developed in [1b], [28], [9]. Specifically we will show that, using phase-space functions it is possible to write down meaningful quantum kinetic equations, formally identical to their classical analogues, in which the ordinary product of functions is replaced by the $*_{\Omega}$ -product (6).

Compatibility of the two methods mentioned above follows then from the results of the next section, namely that in the corresponding quantum formalism the resulting quantum equations, when Ω -transformed, are identical to their classical counterparts expressed with the aid of the $*_{\Omega}$ -product.

4.2 As mentioned above, we consider an open system Σ , interacting with a much larger one, the reservoir R , which is originally in an equilibrium state ρ_R . We suppose

(6) This may be helpful in examining the conditions under which the formalism gives well-defined results in the limit in which the $*_{\Omega}$ -product and/or the associated bracket reduce to the ordinary product and the Poisson bracket respectively. This is closely related to the problems addressed in paper III, briefly discussed at the end of section 1 (see the comments following proposition 3.5 and end of this section).

that the Liouville operator (1.2) is

$$L = L_\Sigma + L_R + \lambda L_I \equiv L_0 + \lambda L_I \quad (4.6a)$$

$$H = H_\Sigma + H_R + \lambda H_I \quad (4.6b)$$

with L_Σ defined by H_Σ and similarly for L_R, L_I , and where L_Σ, L_R depend only on the phases of Σ, R respectively and L_I is an interaction term, λ being the coupling parameter. It is possible to develop a general formalism for the time evolution of the state of Σ , assuming that R , being much larger than Σ , practically remains in the equilibrium state ρ_R [9]. The formalism uses projection-operator methods and leads to explicit results for specific systems (see e.g. [16]).

In particular for weak-coupling (i.e. omitting terms of order higher than λ^2) the formalism has been studied in [9]. *Below we show that the same formalism can be developed for quantum systems, starting from the Ω -transform of the von Neumann equation.* Mathematically speaking this is identical to expressing this formalism for *classical* systems with the $*_\Omega$ -product replacing the ordinary product of functions.

It is clear that *the only points of the formalism needing special consideration are those involving products of functions.*

A careful analysis of [9] shows that *these are*:

- (i) The definition of the projection P on the state of Σ

$$P\rho(z_\Sigma, z_R, t) \equiv \rho_R(z_R) \int \rho(z_\Sigma, z_R, t) dz_R \equiv \rho_R(z_R) f_\Sigma(z_\Sigma, t) \quad (4.7)$$

where $z_\Sigma = (q_\Sigma, p_\Sigma)$, $z_R = (q_R, p_R)$ are the phases of Σ, R respectively. From this we have for its adjoint

$$P^+ A(z_\Sigma, z_R) = \int \rho_R(z_R) A(z_\Sigma, z_R) dz_R \quad (4.7')$$

- (ii) The basic properties of P , namely

$$PL_\Sigma = L_\Sigma P \quad (4.8a)$$

$$PL_R = L_R P = 0 \quad (4.8b)$$

- (iii) L, L_Σ, L_R, L_I are formally self-adjoint.

If (4.7), (4.7'), (4.8) can be verified for a $*_\Omega$ -product then the *whole formalism is valid and any existing kinetic equation in that formalism is obtained by rewriting it using the $*_\Omega$ -product.*

In the notation of section 2, with subscripts to distinguish between Σ and R , we define

$$P\rho(z_\Sigma, z_R, t) \equiv \rho_R(z_R) *_\Omega \int \rho dz_R \equiv \rho_R(z_R) *_\Omega f_\Sigma(z_\Sigma, t) \quad (4.9)$$

where ρ_R is such that

$$[H_R, \rho_R] = 0 \quad (4.10)$$

In general $\rho_R *_\Omega f_\Sigma \neq \rho_R f_\Sigma$ but it is *reasonable to require* that if $A_\Sigma = A_\Sigma(z_\Sigma)$, $A_R = A_R(z_R)$ and if $\Omega(A_\Sigma) \equiv \hat{A}_\Sigma$, $\Omega(A_R) \equiv \hat{A}_R$ then $\Omega(A_\Sigma A_R) = \hat{A}_\Sigma \hat{A}_R$. Then we readily find that

$$\Omega(\sigma_\Sigma, \sigma_R) = \Omega(0, \sigma_R)\Omega(\sigma_\Sigma, 0) \equiv \Omega(\sigma_R)\Omega(\sigma_\Sigma) \quad (4.11)$$

From (4.11), (3.3) we then get

$$A_\Sigma *_\Omega A_R = A_\Sigma A_R \quad (4.12)$$

and therefore (4.9) reduces to (4.7). Using (4.11), (3.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int H_\Sigma(z_\Sigma) *_\Omega \rho(z_\Sigma, z_R) dz_R = \\ & = \int d\sigma_\Sigma d\sigma'_\Sigma \tilde{H}_\Sigma(\sigma_\Sigma) \tilde{\rho}(\sigma'_\Sigma, 0) \frac{\Omega(\sigma_\Sigma)\Omega(\sigma'_\Sigma)}{\Omega(\sigma_\Sigma + \sigma'_\Sigma)} e^{i(\sigma_\Sigma + \sigma'_\Sigma)z_\Sigma} e^{\mu(\sigma'_\Sigma \wedge \sigma_\Sigma)} \end{aligned}$$

(in the rest of this section numerical constants depending on $(2\pi)^{-1}$ are omitted). Since $\int \rho(z_\Sigma, z_R) dz_R = \int e^{i\sigma'_\Sigma z_\Sigma} \tilde{\rho}(\sigma'_\Sigma, 0) d\sigma'_\Sigma$ we immediately find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int H_\Sigma(z_\Sigma) *_\Omega \rho(z_\Sigma, z_R) dz_R = H_\Sigma(z_\Sigma) *_\Omega \int \rho(z_\Sigma, z_R) dz_R = \\ & = H_\Sigma(z_\Sigma) *_\Omega f_\Sigma(z_\Sigma) \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Therefore using (4.12), (4.13) and the associativity of the $*_\Omega$ -product we obtain

$$P([H_\Sigma, \rho]) = [H_\Sigma, P\rho]$$

hence (4.8a) holds. On the other hand, in the same way using (4.12), (4.10), we have

$$([H_R, \cdot]P)\rho = [H_R, \rho_R *_\Omega f_\Sigma] = f_\Sigma[H_R, \rho_R] = 0$$

so that the 2nd of (4.8b) holds. Finally with the aid of (3.5)

$$\begin{aligned}
(P[H_R, \cdot])\rho &= \rho_R \int [H_R, \rho] dz_R = \\
&= \rho_R \int d\sigma_\Sigma d\sigma_R d\sigma'_\Sigma d\sigma'_R dz_R \left(\tilde{H}_R(\sigma_R) \delta(\sigma_\Sigma) \tilde{\rho}(\sigma'_\Sigma, \sigma'_R) \right. \\
&\quad \frac{\Omega(\sigma_\Sigma) \Omega(\sigma_R) \Omega(\sigma'_\Sigma) \Omega(\sigma'_R)}{\Omega(\sigma_\Sigma + \sigma'_\Sigma) \Omega(\sigma_R + \sigma'_R)} e^{[i(\sigma_\Sigma + \sigma'_\Sigma) z_\Sigma + i(\sigma_R + \sigma'_R) z_R]} \\
&\quad \left. 2 \sinh \mu \{ (\eta'_\Sigma, \eta'_R) \cdot (\xi_\Sigma, \xi_R) - (\eta_\Sigma, \eta_R) \cdot (\xi'_\Sigma, \xi'_R) \} \right) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

as simple reductions show.

The formal adjoint P^+ of P can be found as follows: For any $A, \rho \in F(\Gamma)$

$$< A, \rho > \equiv \int A^* *_\Omega \rho dz_\Sigma dz_R$$

is a bilinear, hermitian form (c.f. [7] p.116-117) and we define

$$\begin{aligned}
< P^+ A, \rho > &\equiv < A, P\rho > \quad \Leftrightarrow \\
&\int (P^+ A)^* *_\Omega \rho dz_\Sigma dz_R = \int A^* *_\Omega (\rho_R *_\Omega f_\Sigma) dz_\Sigma dz_R = \\
&\int \left(\int A^* *_\Omega \rho_R dz_R \right) *_\Omega f_\Sigma dz_\Sigma = \int \left(\int A^* *_\Omega \rho_R dz'_R \right) *_\Omega \rho dz_\Sigma dz_R
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $P^+ A = (\int A^* *_\Omega \rho_R dz_R)^*$. Assuming that (3.16') holds and ρ_R is real we finally have

$$P^+ A = \int \rho_R *_\Omega A dz_R \quad (4.14)$$

In the same way we define the Liouville operator for the real Hamiltonian H , by

$$L = \frac{i}{2\mu} [H, \cdot]$$

hence for any A, ρ , we have $< A, L\rho > = < L^+ A, \rho >$. But

$$< A, L\rho > = \int A^* *_\Omega L\rho dz_\Sigma dz_R = \int L(A^* *_\Omega \rho) dz_\Sigma dz_R - \int (LA^*) *_\Omega dz_\Sigma dz_R$$

By (3.5) the first term is zero hence

$$\langle A, L\rho \rangle = -\frac{i}{2\mu} \int [H, A^*] *_\Omega \rho \, dz_\Sigma dz_R = \frac{i}{2\mu} \int [H, A]^* *_\Omega \rho \, dz_\Sigma dz_R$$

where (3.16') and the reality of H have been used. Therefore L is formally self-adjoint.

Summarizing the above results we may say that *if (3.16), (3.17), (4.11) hold* then the formalism in [9] is valid using the $*_\Omega$ -product. In particular the expressions for the generator Φ (eqs (4.4), (4.22), (4.21) of [9]) are valid provided that the usual product of functions is everywhere replaced by the $*_\Omega$ -product.

In section 1 we remarked that this formalism is valid under the assumption that L_Σ has a point spectrum, a rather severe restriction for *classical* systems. It was also mentioned that in *specific* examples in which the system Σ under consideration is approximated by a system Σ_ω , depending on some parameter ω for which L_{Σ_ω} has a point spectrum and for which $L_{\Sigma_\omega} \rightarrow L_\Sigma$ as $\omega \rightarrow \omega_0$ say, the corresponding kinetic equation has no limit ([16], [21] ch 7). In [11] it has been conjectured that this may be due to the fact that the perturbation is via a *differential* (hence unbounded in general) operator L_I . The present formalism gives the possibility to treat the problem more generally: To consider a $*_\Omega$ -product depending on two parameters a, b such that the one measures the discreteness of the spectrum of L_Σ , the other the deviation of $[\ , \]_\Omega$ from the Poisson bracket and take the corresponding limits of the general kinetic equation for the state of Σ (c.f. the comments on the $*_\lambda$ product in section 3 and footnote in this section). This will be considered in paper III.

5. PHASE-SPACE KINETIC EQUATIONS FOR QUANTUM OPEN SYSTEMS

In what follows we will apply the formalism developed in section 4 to quantum open systems weakly coupled to a large reservoir at an equilibrium state $\hat{\rho}_R$. To this end we will employ the general formalism developed in [9] as applied to quantum systems, a brief account of the basic assumptions of which has been given in the previous section. In fact it is not difficult to see that by making use of the correspondence rules

$$\frac{\hat{A}\hat{B} + \hat{B}\hat{A}}{2} \equiv [\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_+ \leftrightarrow AB \tag{5.1a}$$

$$\frac{1}{i\hbar}[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \leftrightarrow \{A, B\} \tag{5.1b}$$

$$\hat{P}\hat{\rho} \equiv \hat{\rho}_R Tr_R \hat{\rho} \leftrightarrow P\rho = \rho_R \int dx_R \rho(x_\Sigma, x_R) \quad (5.1c)$$

$$\hat{P}^+ \hat{A}^+ = Tr_R(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{A}^+) \leftrightarrow P^+ A^* = \int dx_R \rho_R A \quad (5.1d)$$

$$\hat{A}^+ \leftrightarrow A^* \quad (5.1e)$$

we can obtain the corresponding general kinetic equation for a *quantum* open system in exactly the same way we did for its classical counterpart, eqs. (4.4), (4.4'), (4.22), (4.22') there and under the same assumptions ([9] section 2, c.f. section 4.2 here). For the sake of brevity we explicit the equation for the state $\hat{\rho}$ of the open system Σ ⁽⁷⁾.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_\Sigma + \lambda^2 \hat{F}, \hat{\rho}] \\ & - \frac{\lambda^2}{2\hbar^2} \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T dt \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds Tr_R([\hat{H}_I(t), [\hat{H}_I(t+s), \hat{\rho}_R \hat{\rho}]]) \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$\hat{F} = \frac{i}{2\hbar} \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T dt \int_0^\infty ds Tr_R(\hat{\rho}_R [\hat{H}_I(t), \hat{H}_I(t+s)]) \quad (5.3a)$$

$$\hat{H}_I(t) = e^{i\hat{L}_0 t} \hat{H}_I \quad (5.3b)$$

(cf. (4.6a)). For a separable interaction⁽⁸⁾

$$\hat{H}_I = \sum_\alpha \hat{Q}_\alpha(x_\Sigma) \hat{W}_\alpha(x_R) = \sum_\alpha \hat{Q}_\alpha^+(x_\Sigma) \hat{W}_\alpha^+(x_R) \quad (5.4)$$

we obtain the quantum analogues of eqs. (4.22), (4.22') of [9] (see also [21] section 4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_\Sigma, \hat{\rho}] \\ & - \frac{i\lambda^2}{2\hbar^2} \left[\sum_{\alpha, \beta, \omega} i\bar{h}_{\alpha\beta}^q(\omega + i0) [\hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega), \hat{V}_\beta(\omega)] + i\bar{g}_{\alpha\beta}^q(\omega + i0) [\hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega), \hat{V}_\beta(\omega)]_+, \hat{\rho} \right] \end{aligned}$$

⁽⁷⁾ Notice that other approaches lead to formally identical results (e.g. [22]-[24], see also below).

⁽⁸⁾ Notice that α is in general a set of presumably continuous indices.

$$-\frac{\lambda^2}{2\hbar} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\omega} \left(\tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}^q(\omega) \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[\hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega), [\hat{V}_\beta(\omega), \hat{\rho}] \right] + \frac{\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}^q(\omega)}{\hbar} \left[\hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega), [\hat{V}_\beta(\omega), \hat{\rho}]_+ \right] \right) \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$V_\alpha(\omega) \equiv \mathcal{F}_\omega Q_\alpha,$$

$\mathcal{F}_\omega$ being the eigenprojections of L_Σ , and

$$\tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}^q(\omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds \ e^{i\omega s} < [\hat{W}_\alpha^+, \hat{W}_\beta(s)]_+ > \quad (5.6a)$$

$$\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}^q(\omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds \ e^{i\omega s} < [\hat{W}_\alpha^+, \hat{W}_\beta(s)] > \quad (5.6b)$$

$$\bar{h}_{\alpha\beta}^q(\omega + i0) \equiv \int_0^{+\infty} ds \ e^{i\omega s} < [\hat{W}_\alpha^+, \hat{W}_\beta(s)]_+ > \quad (5.6c)$$

$$\bar{g}_{\alpha\beta}^q(\omega + i0) \equiv \int_0^{+\infty} ds \ e^{i\omega s} < [\hat{W}_\alpha^+, \hat{W}_\beta(s)] > \quad (5.6d)$$

$< \hat{A} >$ denoting $Tr(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{A})$ and $\hat{W}_\beta(s) = e^{iL_R s} \hat{W}_\beta$.

It is clear from (2.13), that an Ω -transformation of (5.5) gives eqs. (4.22), (4.22') of [9] with the $*_\Omega$ -product replacing the ordinary product of functions. This shows explicitly the compatibility of the two methods to obtain the phase-space expression of a quantum kinetic equation, mentioned in section 4.

It can be shown, ([21] section 4.3) that expanding the coefficients in (5.5) and using that by the stationarity of $\hat{\rho}_R$ (i.e. $[\hat{H}_R, \hat{\rho}_R] = 0$), $h_{\alpha\beta}(s) = h_{\beta\alpha}^*(-s)$ where

$$h_{\alpha\beta}(s) \equiv < \hat{W}_\alpha^+ \hat{W}_\beta(s) > \quad (5.7)$$

(5.5) takes the more familiar form (e.g. [22] eq.(III.19), [23] eq.(4.9))

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_\Sigma, \hat{\rho}] + \frac{i\lambda^2}{\hbar} \left[\frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\omega} s_{\alpha\beta}(\omega + i0) \hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega) \hat{V}_\beta(\omega), \hat{\rho} \right] + \\ & + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\hbar^2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\omega} \tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega) \left(\left[\hat{V}_\beta(\omega) \hat{\rho}, \hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega) \right] + \left[\hat{V}_\beta(\omega), \hat{\rho} \hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega) \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where

$$\tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds \ e^{i\omega s} h_{\alpha\beta}(s) = \tilde{h}_{\beta\alpha}^*(\omega) \quad (5.9a)$$

$$s_{\alpha\beta}(\omega+i0) \equiv (\Im \bar{h}(\omega+i0))_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\bar{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega+i0) - \bar{h}_{\beta\alpha}^*(\omega+i0)}{2i} \quad (5.9b)$$

$$\bar{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega+i0) = \int_0^{+\infty} ds e^{i\omega s} h_{\alpha\beta}(s) \quad (5.9c)$$

Using that $\tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega)$ is a nonnegative-definite matrix (see Appendix), equation (5.8) when expanded, can be put in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_\Sigma, \hat{\rho}] + \frac{i\lambda^2}{\hbar} \left[\frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\omega} s_{\alpha\beta}(\omega+i0) \hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega) \hat{V}_\beta(\omega) \right] \\ & - \frac{\lambda^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_{\gamma,\omega} \left(\left[\hat{U}_\gamma^+(\omega) \hat{U}_\gamma(\omega), \hat{\rho} \right]_+ - \hat{U}_\gamma(\omega) \hat{\rho} \hat{U}_\gamma^+(\omega) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$\hat{U}_\gamma(\omega) \equiv \sum_\beta k_{\gamma\beta}(\omega) \hat{V}_\beta(\omega) \quad (5.10'a)$$

$$\tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega) = \sum_\gamma k_{\gamma\alpha}^*(\omega) k_{\gamma\beta}(\omega) \quad (5.10'b)$$

This is of the form

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_\Sigma + \lambda^2 \hat{F}, \hat{\rho}] - \frac{\lambda^2}{\hbar^2} [\hat{R}, \hat{A}]_+ + \frac{\lambda^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_n \hat{A}_n \hat{\rho} \hat{A}_n^+ \quad (5.10'')$$

where

$$\hat{A}_n \equiv \hat{U}_\gamma(\omega) \quad , \quad \hat{R} \equiv \sum_n \hat{A}_n^+ \hat{A}_n$$

$$\hat{F} = -\frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\omega} s_{\alpha\beta}(\omega+i0) \hat{V}_\alpha^+(\omega) \hat{V}_\beta(\omega)$$

That is, it has the form of the Lindblad generator of a semigroup conserving density matrices ([24] Theorem 2). Notice that simple reductions transforms (5.8), (5.10'') to the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_\Sigma + \lambda^2 \hat{F}, \hat{\rho}] - \\ & - \frac{\lambda^2}{2\hbar^2} \sum_{n,m} h_{nm} \left(\frac{1}{2} [\hat{B}_n^+, [\hat{B}_m, \hat{\rho}]] + \frac{1}{2} [\hat{B}_m, [\hat{B}_n^+, \hat{\rho}]] + \right. \\ & \left. + [\hat{B}_n^+, [\hat{B}_m, \hat{\rho}]_+] - [\hat{B}_m, [\hat{B}_n^+, \hat{\rho}]_+] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.8')$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_\Sigma + \lambda^2 \hat{F}, \hat{\rho}] - \\ & -\frac{\lambda^2}{2\hbar^2} \sum_n \left(\frac{1}{2} [\hat{A}_n^+, [\hat{A}_n, \hat{\rho}]] + \frac{1}{2} [\hat{A}_n, [\hat{A}_n^+, \hat{\rho}]] + [\hat{A}_n^+, [\hat{A}_n, \hat{\rho}]_+] - [\hat{A}_n, [\hat{A}_n^+, \hat{\rho}]_+] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

where $\hat{B}_n \equiv \hat{V}_\alpha(\omega)$, $h_{nm} = \tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega)$.

The formalism developped in the previous sections gives us the possibility to obtain a phase-space counterpart of the kinetic equation for $\hat{\rho}$ in any of the *equivalent* forms (5.2), (5.5), (5.8'), (5.10) or (5.11), by using generalized Wigner transformations (2.11). To this end it is clear that we need explicit expressions for the generalized Wigner transform of operators of the form

$$[\hat{f}, \hat{g}], \quad [\hat{f}, \hat{g}]_+, \quad \hat{f}\hat{g}\hat{h}, \quad [\hat{f}, [\hat{g}, \hat{h}]], \quad [\hat{f}, [\hat{g}, \hat{h}]_+], \quad [\hat{f}, [\hat{g}, \hat{h}]]_+$$

(the last one is needed in the calculation of the adjoint kinetic equation, for the observables).

These however, are readily obtained from the results of section 3: By (2.13) $F(\Gamma)$ equipped with the $*_\Omega$ -product and its associated bracket, is homomorphic via an Ω -transformation to the algebra of operators. Therefore the Ω -transform of the above operators are the same, with $\hat{f}$ replaced by $f \equiv \Omega^{-1}(\hat{f})$ etc, and the operator product replaced by $*_\Omega$. In the notation of section (2.1), we obtain from (3.3)

$$[f, g]_+ = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') \frac{\Omega(\sigma)\Omega(\sigma')}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma')} \cosh \mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma) e^{i(\sigma + \sigma')z} \quad (5.12a)$$

$$[f, g] =$$

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma) \tilde{g}(\sigma') \frac{\Omega(\sigma)\Omega(\sigma')}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma')} 2 \sinh \mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma) e^{i(\sigma + \sigma')z} \quad (5.12b)$$

$$[\widetilde{f, g}]_+ = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma') \tilde{g}(\sigma - \sigma') \frac{\Omega(\sigma')\Omega(\sigma - \sigma')}{\Omega(\sigma)} \cosh \mu(\sigma \wedge \sigma') \quad (5.13a)$$

$$[\widetilde{f, g}] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\sigma' \tilde{f}(\sigma') \tilde{g}(\sigma - \sigma') \frac{\Omega(\sigma')\Omega(\sigma - \sigma')}{\Omega(\sigma)} 2 \sinh \mu(\sigma \wedge \sigma') \quad (5.13b)$$

From (3.4), (3.3) an elementary calculation using (2.12), gives

$$f *_\Omega (g *_\Omega h) =$$

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\sigma d\sigma' d\sigma'' \frac{\tilde{f}_w(\sigma) \tilde{g}_w(\sigma') \tilde{h}_w(\sigma'')}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')} e^{i(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')z} e^{\mu(\sigma + \sigma') \wedge (\sigma'' + \sigma')} \quad (5.14)$$

Similarly, using (5.12), (5.13) we get

$$[f, [g, h]] = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\sigma d\sigma' d\sigma'' \frac{\tilde{f}_w(\sigma) \tilde{g}_w(\sigma') \tilde{h}_w(\sigma'')}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')} e^{i(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')z} 4 \sinh \mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma'') \sinh \mu(\sigma \wedge (\sigma' + \sigma'')) \quad (5.15a)$$

$$[f, [g, h]_+] = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\sigma d\sigma' d\sigma'' \frac{\tilde{f}_w(\sigma) \tilde{g}_w(\sigma') \tilde{h}_w(\sigma'')}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')} e^{i(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')z} (-2) \cosh \mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma'') \sinh \mu(\sigma \wedge (\sigma' + \sigma'')) \quad (5.15b)$$

$$[f, [g, h]]_+ = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\sigma d\sigma' d\sigma'' \frac{\tilde{f}_w(\sigma) \tilde{g}_w(\sigma') \tilde{h}_w(\sigma'')}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')} e^{i(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')z} (-2) \sinh \mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma'') \cosh \mu(\sigma \wedge (\sigma' + \sigma'')) \quad (5.15c)$$

Assuming that the Ω -transformation is involutive, i.e. (3.16) holds, eqs (5.15) imply that the phase-space transform of the dissipative part of (5.11), i.e. of the sum over n , is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda^2}{(2\pi)^3 \hbar^2} \sum_n \int d\sigma d\sigma' d\sigma'' \left(-\tilde{A}_n(\sigma) \tilde{A}_n^*(\sigma') \sinh \mu(\sigma \wedge (\sigma' + \sigma'')) e^{\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma'')z} + \right. \\ & \left. + \tilde{A}_n^*(\sigma) \tilde{A}_n(\sigma') \sinh \mu(\sigma \wedge (\sigma' + \sigma'')) e^{-\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma'')z} \right) \tilde{\rho}_w(\sigma'') \frac{e^{i(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')z}}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')} \end{aligned}$$

where from now on for the sake of brevity we omit the subscript w from $\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{B}_n$ etc.

In the second term we make the substitutions $\sigma \rightarrow -\sigma, \sigma' \rightarrow -\sigma', \sigma'' \rightarrow -\sigma''$ and using that in general $\tilde{A}_n^*(-\sigma) = (\tilde{A}_n(\sigma))^*$ and $\tilde{\rho}_w(-\sigma'') = (\tilde{\rho}_w(\sigma''))^*$ since ρ_w is real ($\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}^+$ and proposition 3.4), we find that it is the complex conjugate of the first term. Hence

Ω^{-1} - transform of the dissipative part of (5.11) =

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{2\lambda^2}{(2\pi)^3 \hbar^2} \Re \left(\int d\sigma d\sigma' d\sigma'' \frac{e^{i(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')z}}{\Omega(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')} \right. \\ & \left. \sum_n \tilde{A}_n^*(\sigma') \tilde{A}_n(\sigma) \tilde{\rho}_w(\sigma'') \sinh \mu(\sigma \wedge (\sigma' + \sigma'')) e^{\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma'')z} \right) \quad (5.16) \end{aligned}$$

An exactly similar calculation gives the Ω^{-1} -transform of (5.8'):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H_\Sigma, \rho] + \frac{2\lambda^2 i}{(2\pi)^3 \hbar^2} \int d\sigma d\sigma' d\sigma'' \frac{e^{i(\sigma+\sigma'+\sigma'')z}}{\Omega(\sigma+\sigma'+\sigma'')} \\ & \bar{B}(\sigma', \sigma'') \tilde{\rho}_w(\sigma) e^{\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma'')} \sinh \mu(\sigma \wedge (\sigma' + \sigma'')) - \\ & - \frac{2\lambda^2 i}{(2\pi)^3 \hbar^2} \Re \int d\sigma d\sigma' d\sigma'' \frac{e^{i(\sigma+\sigma'+\sigma'')}}{\Omega(\sigma+\sigma'+\sigma'')} \\ & B(\sigma', \sigma) \tilde{\rho}_w(\sigma'') e^{\mu(\sigma' \wedge \sigma'')} \sinh \mu(\sigma \wedge (\sigma' + \sigma'')) \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

where

$$B(\sigma', \sigma) \equiv \sum_{n,m} \tilde{B}_n^*(\sigma') h_{nm} \tilde{B}_m(\sigma) \quad (5.18a)$$

$$\bar{B}(\sigma', \sigma) \equiv \sum_{n,m} \tilde{B}_n^*(\sigma') s_{nm} \tilde{B}_m(\sigma) \quad (5.18b)$$

$$h_{nm} \equiv \tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega), \quad s_{nm} \equiv s_{\alpha\beta}(\omega + i0) \quad (5.18c)$$

Notice that by $\tilde{A}^*(\sigma) = (\tilde{A}(-\sigma))^*$, and the self-adjointness of the matrices h_{nm}, s_{nm} , we get

$$B^*(\sigma', \sigma) = B(-\sigma, -\sigma') \quad \bar{B}^*(\sigma', \sigma) = \bar{B}(-\sigma, -\sigma')$$

Remarks: (i) We do not explicit $[H_\Sigma, \rho]$ since this is a direct application of (5.12b).

(ii) Eq (5.16) is a special case of (5.17) when $h_{nm} = \delta_{nm}$.

(iii) A similar expression, though less symmetric than (5.17), can be obtained for the phase-space transform of (5.5), having the advantage of showing more directly the relation of quantum to classical kinetic equations.

From the above discussion we see that a phase-space formulation via Ω -transformations of quantum kinetic equations for open systems interacting with an equilibrium bath, with a separable interaction, is straightforward provided we are able to calculate the *Wigner* transforms of the operators $\hat{V}_\alpha(\omega)$ or $\hat{A}_n$ (c.f. (5.5), (5.10'')). Notice that the correlation matrices $\tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega), s_{\alpha\beta}(\omega + i0)$ etc are calculated quantum mechanically, hence the bath introduces no additional computational difficulties in this formalism.

Of course as it can be readily seen from (2.13), in the general case, a phase-space transformation of (5.2), (5.3) requires the calculation of functions like

$$\Omega^{-1}(\hat{H}_I(t)) = e^{itL_I^\Omega} H_I$$

where

$$L_I^\Omega \equiv \frac{1}{\hbar} [H_I, \cdot], \quad H_I = \Omega^{-1}(\hat{H}_I)$$

not an easy task even in simple examples (see e.g. [7], and the general formalism in [8]). Alternatively we may calculate $\Omega^{-1}(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega \hat{H}_I)$, $\mathcal{F}_\omega$ being the eigenprojections of $\hat{L}_0$, (cf. (4.6a)), not an easy task either. Moreover, in this case phase-space quantities of the bath, must be calculated explicitly, which often requires this to be done *before* the passage to the thermodynamic limit of an infinite bath is performed. Hence the present formalism has to be extended to the case when $\hat{q}$ or $\hat{p}$ have discrete spectrum. Although this is possible, and involves no difficulties of principle, we will not reproduce the calculations here (see the remark at the end of section 2) but postpone them till their use in paper III.

Acknowledgement: The motivation for the study of generalized Moyal structures in section 3 came out of stimulating discussions of Dr. A. Dimakis and one of us (C.T.).

APPENDIX

We must show that for any $\xi_\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\sum_{\alpha, \beta} \tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega) \xi_\alpha^* \xi_\beta \geq 0$$

Putting $\hat{\phi}(s) = \sum_\alpha \xi_\alpha \hat{W}_\alpha(s)$, we have that

$$g(s) \equiv \langle \hat{\phi}^+ \hat{\phi}(s) \rangle = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(s) \xi_\alpha^* \xi_\beta$$

But $g(s)$ is a positive-definite function in the sense that it satisfies

$$\sum_{i, j} g(s_i - s_j) z_i z_j^* \geq 0 \quad \text{for any } s_i \in \mathcal{R}, \quad z_i \in \mathcal{C}$$

Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i, j} g(s_i - s_j) z_i z_j^* &= \sum_{i, j} \langle \hat{\phi}^+ \hat{\phi}(s_i - s_j) z_i z_j^* \rangle = \\ &= \sum_{i, j} \langle (z_j \hat{\phi})^+ e^{-iL_R s_j} e^{iL_R s_i} (z_i \hat{\phi}) \rangle = \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i,j} < (e^{iL_R s_j} (z_j \hat{\phi}))^+ (e^{iL_R s_i} z_i \hat{\phi}) > = \sum_{i,j} Tr(\hat{\rho}_R \hat{A}_j^+ \hat{A}_j) \geq 0$$

since $\hat{\rho}_R$ is a positive-definite operator. Here $\hat{A}_j \equiv e^{iL_R s_j} (z_j \hat{\phi})$ and in the 4th equality we used the stationarity of $\hat{\rho}_R$. Since $\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \tilde{h}_{\alpha\beta}(\omega) \xi_\alpha^* \xi_\beta$ is the Fourier transform of $g(s)$, the result follows from the Bochner-Wiener- Khinchine theorem ([27], [17]).

REFERENCES

- 1)(a) I. Prigogine, C. George, F. Henin and L. Rosenfeld, *Chemica Scripta* **4** (1973) 5
 (b) I. Prigogine and A. P. Grecos in: "*Problems in the Foundations of physics*", G. Toraldo di Francia (ed.) North Holland (1979)
- 2) R. Balescu, "*Equilibrium and non-equilibrium statistical mechanics*", Wiley (1975) chs 2, 3, 15-18
 R. Balescu "*Statistical mechanics of charged particles*", Wiley (1963)
- 3) H. Weyl "*The theory of groups and quantum mechanics*" Dover(1950), ch 4 § 14
- 4) J. E. Moyal Proc. Cambridge Phil Soc **45** (1949) 99
- 5) (a) G. S. Agarwal and E. Wolf, Phys. Rev. D **2** (1970) 2161, 2187, 2206
 (b) J. R. Klauder and E. C. G. Sudarshan, "*Fundamentals of quantum optics*", W. A. Benjamin (1968)
- 6) (a) M. Hillery, R. F. O'Connell, M. O. Scully and E P Wigner, Phys. Reports **106** No3 (1984) 121
 (b) J. G. Krüger and A. Poffyn, Physica **85A** (1976) 84
- 7) F. Bayen, M. Flato, C. Fronsdal, A. Lichnerowicz and D. Sternheimer, Ann. Physics **110** (1978) 111
- 8) M. Gadella, J. M. Gracia-Bondia, L. M. Nieto and J. C. Varilly, J. Phys A **22** (1989) 2709
 M. Gadella, L. M. Nieto (1993 preprint)
- 9) A. P. Grecos and C. Tzanakis, Physica A **151** (1988) 61
- 10) C. Tzanakis and A. P. Grecos, Physica A **149** (1988) 232
- 11) C. Tzanakis, Physica A **179** (1991) 531
- 12) E. P. Wigner, Phys Rev **40** (1932) 749
- 13) (a) P. Carruthers and M. M. Nieto, Rev. Mod Phys **40** (1968) 411
 (b) P. G. Newton, Ann. Physics **124** (1980) 327
 (c) M. Moshinsky and T. H. Seligman, Ann. Physics **114** (1978) 243
 M. Moshinsky and T. H. Seligman, Ann. Physics **120** (1979) 402
 J. Deenen, M. Moshinsky and T. H. Seligman, Ann. Physics **127** (1980) 458
- 14) G. V. Dunne, J.Phys A **21** (1988) 2321
- 15) (a) A. Dimakis and F. Müller-Hoissen, Let. Math. Physics **28** (1993) 123
 (b) H. Baehr, A. Dimakis and F. Müller-Hoissen, J. Phys A **28** (1995) 3197
- 16) C. Tzanakis, Physica A **151** (1988) 90
- 17) I. M. Gel'fand and N. Y. Vilenkin, "*Generalized functions: Applications of harmonic analysis*", Academic Press (1964), ch II
- 18) P. Fletcher, Phys. Let. B **248** (1990) 323
- 19) W. Pauli, "*General principles of Quantum mechanics*", Springer (1980), section 12, p. 100
- 20) P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **111** (1926) 281
- 21) C. Tzanakis, Ph. D. Thesis, Université Libre de Bruxelles (1987)

- 22) H. Spohn and J. L. Lebowitz, Adv. Chem. Physics **38** (1978) 109
- 23) E. B. Davies, Comm. Math. Physics **39** (1974) 91
- 24) G. Lindblad, Comm. Math. Physics **48** (1976) 119
- 25) W. H. Louisell, "*Quantum statistical properties of radiation* Wiley Interscience (1973)
- 26) I. M. Gel'fand and G. E. Shilov "*Generalized functions: Properties and operators*", Academic Press (1964)
- 27) C. Tzanakis, Nuovo Cimento **108B** (1993) 339
- 28) A. P. Grecos, in "*Singularities and dynamical systems*" S. Pnevmatikos (ed.), North-Holland (1983)
- 29) A. Frigerio and V. Gorini, J. Math. Phys. **25** (1984) 1050
- 30) A. Dimakis and C. Tzanakis, "*Noncommutative geometry and kinetic theory*", to appear in J. Phys. A (1996)
- 31) C. Tzanakis, "*Linear kinetic equations for classical systems: Explicit form and its mathematical and physical foundations*", (1995 preprint).